

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 20 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1-13 and claim 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 14-19 have been allowed.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application. However, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application based on the following remarks.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,115,016 to Yoshihara, et al. ("Yoshihara" or the "Yoshihara Reference") in view of U.S. Patent Number 3,654,606 to Marlowe, et al. ("Marlowe" or the "Marlowe Reference"); claims 4 and 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara in view of Marlowe further in view of published Japanese Patent Application Number 04-058708 to Ito, et al. ("Ito" or the "Ito Reference"); and claims 11-13 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara in view of Marlowe further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,317,181 to Hoshino ("Hoshino" or the "Hoshino Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons provided in greater detail below.

**Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10**

The Examiner admits that, Yoshihara does not disclose that the sequence of addressing scan is reversed every one or more display frames, asserting, further, that Marlowe teaches reversing addressing scan every one or more frames and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Yoshihara and Marlowe. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The claim limitation that the sequence of addressing scan "is reversed every one or more display frames" refers to the scanning line sequence. For example, as shown in FIG 1A, in the first frame scanning is performed from scanning line 1 to scanning line n while in the second frame scanning is reversed and scanning is performed from line n to line 1. Hence, the address scanning of the scanning lines is reversed from 1 to n, then from n to 1. Marlowe does not teach, mention or suggest this feature.

Marlowe, in contrast, discloses an LCD device and driving method in which the direction of the application of the electric field is reversed in successive display frames. See, e.g., Marlowe, Abstract. Thus, Marlowe focuses on a single LCD device and not the entire array having multiple scanning lines. This is not the same nor can it be interpreted to mean the same thing as reversing the scanning line sequence.

In short, it is respectfully submitted that, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 are not made obvious by the cited references, and further, satisfy all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 10 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

#### Claims 4 and 8

For the reasons provided above showing that Yoshihara in view of Marlowe do not teach, mention or suggest claim 1 of the present invention, the same references, therefore, cannot make obvious claims depending therefrom. Moreover, the Ito reference, and, more specifically, Ito FIG. 2, cannot make up for the deficiencies of the Yoshihara and Marlowe references. Indeed, Ito does not teach, mention or suggest successively changing the light modulation state and reversing successive display frames so that picture elements ("pixels") have substantially the same light modulation state or addressing scanning when the backlight is OFF or switching the light emitting section ON and OFF exactly once in each display frame.

In short, it is respectfully submitted that, claims 4 and 8 are not made obvious by any of the cited references, and further, satisfy all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). Accordingly, claims 4 and 8 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claims 11-13 and 20

For the reasons provided above showing that Yoshihara in view of Marlowe do not teach, mention or suggest claim 1 of the present invention, the same references, therefore, cannot make obvious claims depending therefrom. Furthermore, the Hoshino reference cannot make up for the deficiencies of the Yoshihara and Marlowe references because Hoshino does not teach, mention or suggest successively changing the light modulation state and reversing successive display frames so that picture elements ("pixels") have substantially the same light modulation state or addressing scanning when the backlight is OFF or switching the light emitting section ON and OFF exactly once in each display frame.

In short, it is respectfully submitted that, claims 11-13 and 20 are not made obvious by any of the cited references, and further, satisfy all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). Accordingly, claims 11-13 and 20 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

A. Tagawa, et al.  
U.S.S.N. 09/923,627  
Page 5

The Applicants believe that no additional fee is required for consideration of the within Response. However, if for any reason the fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 5, 2004

By: 

George W. Hartnell, III  
Reg. No. 42,639

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
Tel.: (617) 517-5523  
Customer No. 21874  
432828



RECEIVED

APR 08 2004

Technology Center 2600

Mailing Date: April 5, 2004 Attorney/Sec: GWH/kag  
Client: 70840 Docket No.: 56373-RCE  
Inventors: A. Tagawa et al.  
Serial No.: 09/923,627 Patent No.:  
Filing Date: 08/07/2001 Grant Date:

The dating stamp of the Patent and Trademark Office hereon will be taken as the date of filing of:

Amendment Transmittal

Response to Office Action

This Return Receipt Postcard

with Certificate - Mailing (4 p.);  
do. (5 p.); and

Due Date: April 30, 2004

Mailing Date: Attorney/Sec:  
Client: Docket No.:  
Inventors:  
Serial No.: Patent No.:  
Filing Date: Grant Date:

The dating stamp of the Patent and Trademark Office hereon will be taken as the date of filing of:

Due Date: